Remarks/Arguments

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed October 14, 2008. To better distinguish their invention from the art of record, applicant have amended claim 15. The amendments find support in the specification at least at page 5, lines 1-8. No new matter has been added.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection and the willingness to allow Claim 16 if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection of Claims 15-20

Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended claim 15 to refer to scaling of an input video signal having pixels in lines and columns into an output video signal having a different number of lines and/or columns. Applicant's video signal constitutes a physical article or object that can be physically transformed, because video signals have distinct electrically measurable physical content. Further, applicant's claimed method produces a useful, concrete and tangible result because the transformation of a video signal (especially in the case of the present invention) yields a result readily visible to persons of ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, the amendments to Claim 15 place the present invention within the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of these claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection of Claims 15 and 17-20

Claims 15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,097,518 (Scott et al.).

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, "distributing the support points of two successive lines or columns of the input video image such that at least one range lying between two

support points of one line or column of the input image spatially overlaps an offset with respect to a corresponding range of a preceding or succeeding line or column of the input video image." Thus, in the present invention, when considering successive lines or columns, ranges between support points spatially overlap with corresponding ranges in successive lines/columns. Providing overlapping ranges between two support points in two successive lines of the input video image can improve the reproduction of details of the input image in the output video image; which otherwise might become lost (specification page 5, lines 1-8).

In contrast, Scott teaches using a fixed distribution pattern of groups of pixels across *both the rows and columns* in processing a video signal (col. 14, lines 4-22, Fig. 4A where group 431 represents a matrix of 3 cells wide and 2 cells high which is logically "OR" operated to produce a value for cell 445 of the reduced image). Hence Scott completely forecloses the possibility of handling rows or columns in a completely independent manner, and also eliminates any possibility of offsetting corresponding ranges in sequentially following rows or columns as matrices bond at least 2 rows or columns in any single pixel group to maintain the quality of a reduced signal.

Thus, Scott fails to teach or suggest at least, "distributing the support points of two successive lines or columns of the input video image such that at least one range lying between two support points of one line or column of the input image spatially overlaps an offset with respect to a corresponding range of a preceding or succeeding line or column of the input video image."

Claim 17 recites the feature of "calculating a pixel or subpixel value for a pixel or subpixel in the output video image from pixel or subpixel values in the input video image lying between a corresponding support point and both neighbouring support points." Hence, the present invention provides enables derivation of a representative output pixel/subpixel from pixels on either side of a support point of the input image. In contrast, Scott teaches strict adherence to derivation (via "OR" operation) of output pixels from *within* a two-dimensional pixel block (col. 14, lines 22-24, and 50-56).

Accordingly, applicants maintain that Claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the art of record, and thus is currently in condition for allowance. Claims 17-20 depend from claim 15 and incorporate by reference all of the features of claim 15. Thus, claims 16-20

are patentable at least due to their dependency from Claim 15. Therefore, applicants request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 15 and 17-20.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the accompany remarks, applicants solicits entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820, for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. Please charge and fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832.**

Respectfully submitted,
Andreas Loew

By: _____
Robert B. Levy, Attorney
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
25 November 2008